



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov
DW Mar-07

KEISLING PIEPER & SCOTT PLC
SUITE 217
1 EAST CENTER STREET
FAYETTEVILLE AR 72701

COPY MAILED

MAR 06 2007

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of :
Lester V. Broersma :
Application No. 10/772,814 : DECISION ON PETITION
Filed: 2 February, 2004 :
Atty Docket No. 013943 :

This is a decision on the petition filed on 19 September, 2006, under 37 CFR 1.137(b),¹ to revive the above-identified application.

The petition is **GRANTED**.

The application became abandoned on 6 January, 2006, for failure to timely submit a response to the non-final Office action mailed on 5 October, 2005, which set a three (3) month shortened statutory period for reply. No extensions of the time for reply

¹ Effective December 1, 1997, the provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b) now provide that where the delay in reply was unintentional, a petition may be filed to revive an abandoned application or a lapsed patent pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b). A grantable petition filed under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b) must be accompanied by:

(1) the required reply, unless previously filed. In a nonprovisional application abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may be met by the filing of a continuing application. In a nonprovisional utility or plant application filed on or after June 8, 1995, and abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may also be met by the filing of a request for continuing examination in compliance with § 1.114. In an application or patent, abandoned or lapsed for failure to pay the issue fee or any portion thereof, the required reply must be the payment of the issue fee or any outstanding balance thereof. In an application, abandoned for failure to pay the publication fee, the required reply must include payment of the publication fee.

(2) the petition fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(m);

(3) a statement that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional. The Commissioner may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional; and

(4) any terminal disclaimer (and fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.20(d)) required pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(c)).

in accordance with 37 CFR 1.136(a) were obtained. Notice of Abandonment was mailed on 10 August, 2006.

Petitioner has filed a reply to the Office action mailed on 5 October, 2005, with the present petition.

The Terminal Disclaimer filed on 19 September, 2006, is not required since the application was not filed prior to 8 June, 1995. Therefore, the Terminal Disclaimer has not been accepted and will not be entered, but will remain in the application file. The Terminal Disclaimer fee of \$130.00 will be refunded to petitioner.

This application is being referred to Technology Center Art Unit 3679 for further processing.

Telephone inquiries concerning this matter may be directed to the undersigned at (571)272-3231.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "D. Wood", is positioned above the typed name.

Douglas I. Wood
Senior Petitions Attorney
Office of Petitions